



cler

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,547	06/21/2001	Catherine G. Bala	FIS9-2000-0416	7268
29154	7590	12/03/2003	EXAMINER	
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC			ART UNIT	
2568-A RIVA ROAD			PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 304			2171	
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003	

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,547	BALA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Etienne P LeRoux	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 19-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,222,666 issued to Ireland et al (hereinafter Ireland '666) in view of US Pat No 5,802,514 issued to Huber (hereinafter Huber '514).

Claim 1:

Ireland '666 discloses:

- creating a query form in said client workstation [Fig 2, item 210 and col 6, lines 39-59 and col 9, line 59 through col 10, line 10];
- receiving a worksheet form in response to said query form, said worksheet form defining selected tabular data [col 8, lines 32-35]
- packaging said worksheet form to represent updated data for said tabular data stream [col 10, lines 36-43], wherein said packaging of said worksheet form includes editing results of said query form [col 10, lines 36-43] and
- saving changes of data contained in said worksheet form in a database of said server [Fig 2, item 230].

Ireland discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Ireland '666 fails to disclose said worksheet form formatted in grid form.

Huber '514 discloses a worksheet in grid form [Fig 4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ireland '666 to include a response in worksheet grid form as taught by Huber '514.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Ireland '666 per the above for the purpose of providing a means to more easily read and understand multiple data entries displayed in tabular format.

Claim 2:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said creating of said query form creates secure complex queries [Fig 2, item 223] based on a selection of table, columns, and constraints maintained in a database of said server computer.

Claim 3:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said receiving of said worksheet grid form creates a snapshot from data in a database of said server [Fig 6, item 610].

Claim 5:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups [Fig 6, item 610].

Claim 8:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes allowing only tables, rows, and columns to be updated by authorized users [Fig 2, item 223 and col 8, lines 12-15].

Claim 10:

Art Unit: 2171

- issuing, by a client process running on a client computer, a query form for data from a database [Fig 2, item 210 and col 6, lines 39-59 and col 9, line 59 through col 10, line 10];
- sending said query form from said client computer to said server computer [col 6, lines 29-38];
- processing said query form, by said server computer [Fig 2, item 221 and col 8, lines 49-55]
- retrieving rows of data satisfying said query form from said database as a worksheet grid form defining selected tabular data [col 8, lines 56-67]
- sending said worksheet grid form from said server computer to said client computer [col 8, lines 56-67]
- packaging, by said client computer, said worksheet grid form representing updated data for marshaling tabular data for transfer between said client computer and said server computer [col 8, lines 56-67]
- wherein said, packaging of said worksheet includes editing [col 10, lines 36-39] results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet form in a database of said server [Fig 2, item 230].

Ireland discloses the elements of claim 10 as noted above.

Ireland ‘666 fails to disclose said worksheet form formatted in grid form.

Huber ‘514 discloses a worksheet in grid form [Fig 4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ireland '666 to include a response in worksheet grid form as taught by Huber '514.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Ireland '666 per the above for the purpose of providing a means to more easily read and understand multiple data entries displayed in tabular format.

Claim 11:

Huber '514 discloses updating said database through said network by transmitting said worksheet grid form from said client computer to said server computer [col 7, lines 1-5].

Claim 13:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups [Fig 6, item 610].

Claim 16:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes allowing only tables, rows, and columns to be updated by authorized users [Fig 2, item 223 and col 8, lines 12-15].

Claim 19:

Ireland '666 discloses:

- receiving a request to create a query form in said client workstation [Fig 2, item 210 and col 6, lines 39-59 and col 9, line 59 through col 10, line10];
- receiving a worksheet defining selected tabular data [col 8, lines 32-35];

- packaging said worksheet representing updated data for said tabular data stream [col 10, lines 36-43], wherein said packaging of said worksheet includes editing results of said query form [col 10, lines 36-43]
- saving changes of data contained in said worksheet in a database of said server [Fig 2, item 230].

Ireland discloses the elements of claim 19 as noted above.

Ireland ‘666 fails to disclose said worksheet form formatted in grid form.

Huber ‘514 discloses a response a worksheet in grid form [Fig 4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ireland ‘666 to include a response in worksheet grid form as taught by Huber ‘514.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Ireland ‘666 per the above for the purpose of providing a means to more easily read and understand multiple data entries displayed in tabular format.

Claim 20:

Ireland ‘666 discloses wherein said creating of said query form creates secure complex queries [Fig 2, item 223] based on a selection of table, columns, and constraints maintained in a database of said server computer.

Claim 21:

Ireland ‘666 discloses wherein said receiving of said worksheet grid form creates a snapshot from data in a database of said server [Fig 6, item 610].

Claim 23:

Ireland '666 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups [Fig 6, item 610].

3. Claims 6, 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0152293 issued to Hahn et al (hereinafter Hahn '293).

Claim 6:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables.

Hahn '293 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables [Fig 5E].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables as taught by Hahn '293.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland 666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of identifying data which has been revised [paragraph 79].

Claim 14:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables.

Hahn '293 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables [Fig 5E].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables as taught by Hahn '293.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland 666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of identifying data which has been revised [paragraph 79].

Claim 24:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the elements of claim 19 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables.

Hahn '293 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables [Fig 5E].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables as taught by Hahn '293.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland 666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of identifying data which has been revised [paragraph 79].

4. Claims 7, 9, 15, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 and further in view of Pub No US 2003/0023609 issued to Della-Libera et al (hereinafter Della-Libera '609).

Claim 7:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of claim 1 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

Della-Libera '609 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables [paragraph 22].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows in a related table [paragraph 0064]

Claim 9:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation as taught by Della-Libera '609.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of maintaining the data in the database at the most recent available.

Claim 15:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of claim 1 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

Della-Libera '609 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables [paragraph 22].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows in a related table [paragraph 0064]

Claim 17:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation as taught by Della-Libera '609.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of maintaining the data in the database at the most recent available.

Claim 25:

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of claim 19 as noted above.

The combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

Della-Libera '609 discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables [paragraph 22].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 per the above for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows in a related table [paragraph 0064]

Regarding claims 9 and 17, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for automatically maintaining a current level of implementation. Della-Libera '609 discloses automatically maintaining a current level of implementation [paragraph 0063]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include automatically maintaining a current level of implementation as taught by Della-Libera '609 for the purpose of maintaining the data in the database at the most recent available.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 and further in view of US Pat No 6,567,915 issued to Guthery (hereinafter Guthery '915).

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above except for partitioning the database into private and public databases. Guthery '915 discloses partitioning the database into private and public databases [col 6, lines 44-50]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include partitioning the database into private and public databases as taught by Guthery

'915 for the purpose of dividing the database into confidential and non-confidential user information [col 6, lines 44-46].

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0167543 issued to Smith et al (hereinafter Smith '543).

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above except for JAVA programming language. Smith '543 discloses JAVA programming language [paragraph 0040]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ireland '666 and Huber '514 to include JAVA programming language as taught by Smith '543 for the purpose of providing a platform independent language [paragraph 0040].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 8, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 8 "Huber and Ireland focus on the ability to generate and execute dynamic read-only queries. Therefore, it is Applicant's position that the combination of Ireland and Huber does not teach or suggest 'editing results of said query form and saving

Art Unit: 2171

changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server' as defined by independent claims 1, 10 and 19."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Paragraph 49 of instant specification discloses the following:

The SCPS application 200 is web-based and has user-friendly GUIs using a form-type format for creating secure complex queries based on selection of table(s), columns, and constraints, running the queries to create a snapshot of the database 160 data on their workstation, **and editing the results of the query on their workstation 150, and when all edits are complete, saving the changes on the archival database 160.** Also, the invention produces reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups, produces subtotals and grand totals if desired, and produces comparison reports on the delta between two similarly structured tables. Further, the invention provides the ability to make mass changes (cascade) to a set of related data, across multiple tables as well as provide an easily administered set of security and controls to ensure users update only the tables, rows, and columns to which they are authorized. Also, the invention provides the ability to initiate batch processes on the database server; and provides an automated method of maintaining the current level of software on the client workstation, to ensure that the client level of code is always current.

Ireland discloses in column 10, lines 36-42 the following:

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Examiner concludes that Ireland reads on the claim 1 limitation "editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server."

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 8, "To the contrary, column 10, lines 36-43 of Ireland addresses the use of JDBC for sending queries to the database server and retrieving a result set back to the

client workstation. More, specifically, in Ireland on the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g. using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment. [.....] Thus, Ireland does not address the editing of the result set on the client, nor the committing of these changes back to the database server.”

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Examiner maintains that the following disclosure by Ireland, column 10, lines 36-38, reads on the claim 1 limitation “editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server.”

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 9 “Huber is principally directed to the utilization of a drag-and-drop interface and is referred to in the Office Action for teaching providing a response in worksheet grid form. Therefore, the Office Action does not propose that Huber teaches (nor does Huber teach or suggest) the claimed feature of ‘editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server’ as defined by independent claims 1, 10 and 19.”

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner maintains that the following disclosure by Ireland, column 10, lines 36-38, reads on the claim 1 limitation “editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server.”

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 10 “The Office Action refers to Hahn as teaching comparing two similarly structured tables in order to overcome a similar lack of teaching in Ireland and Huber. It is Applicant’s position that Hahn discloses the comparison of data in the same table over a period of time, to determine differences in data due to revisions. However, Hahn does not cure the deficiency of Ireland and Huber discuss[ed] above. More specifically, Hahn does not provide any teaching or suggestion of the claimed ‘editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server’ as defined by independent claims 1, 10 and 19.”

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Examiner maintains that the following disclosure by Ireland, column 10, lines 36-38, reads on the claim 1 limitation “editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server.”

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 10 “The Della-Libera reference is utilized for disclosing cascaded mass changes for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows. However, Della-Libera is not referred to for teaching or suggestion (and does not teach or suggest) the feature that is missed by Ireland and Huber as explained above. More specifically, Della-Libera omits any teaching of ‘editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server’ as defined by independent claims 1, 10 and 19.”

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner maintains that the following disclosure by Ireland, column 10, lines 36-38, reads on the claim 1 limitation “editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server.”

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 11 “The Guthery reference is utilized for disclosing partitioning the database into private and public databases. However, Guthery is not referred to for teaching or suggestion (and does not teach or suggest) the feature that is omitted by Ireland and Huber as explained above. More specifically, Guthery does not teach ‘editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server’ as defined by independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner maintains that the following disclosure by Ireland, column 10, lines 36-38, reads on the claim 1 limitation “editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server.”

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 11 “The Smith reference is utilized for disclosing a JAVA programming language. However, Smith is not referred to for teaching or suggesting (and does not teach or suggest) the feature that is left out by Ireland and Huber as explained above. More specifically, Smith skips any teaching of ‘editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in aid worksheet grid form I a database of said server’ as defined by independent claims 1, 10 and 19.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner maintains that the following disclosure by Ireland, column 10, lines 36-38, reads on the claim 1 limitation “editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server.”

On the client side, the user is able to generate a component graphically (e.g., using PowerBuilder or other visual development environment). For a Java component, the system of the present invention generates a stub. The stub, which resembles a Java class, include employs JDBC for sending requests to the component transaction server for receiving tabular result sets back.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states on page 12 “In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-27, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance.”

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Applicant states on page 12, the conclusion that "In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-27, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Examiner is perplexed as the prior art of record is shown in supra Office Action to clearly read on instant invention. Furthermore, examiner notes Rule 37CFR 1.111(b) requires Applicant to "distinctly and specifically point out errors" in the examiner's action. Also, arguments or conclusions of Applicant cannot take the place of evidence. *In re Cole*, 51 CCPA 919, 326F.2d 769, 140 USPQ 230 (1964).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Etienne LeRoux

December 1, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100